

REMARKS

Claims 4, 7, 9, 11, 13, and 15-18 are now all the claims pending in the application.

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, have been canceled. Claims 4, 7, 11, and 15-17 have been amended. Claim 18 is new; it finds support in the specification at lines 4-21 of page 26. No new matter has been introduced.

Because claims have been canceled, Applicant notes that certain grounds for rejection have been obviated. Applicant requests withdrawal of rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 of claims 1-3, 5, and 14 over Sakamoto and rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 of claim 6 over Sakamoto in view of Iwashita; of claim 8 over Sakamoto in view of Shima; of claim 10 over Sakamoto in view of Mogi in further view of well known art; and of claim 12 over Sakamoto in view of Mogi in further view of Shima in further view of well known art.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejected claims 4, 7, 15, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (a) or (e) as allegedly anticipated. Applicant traverses and respectfully argues that Sakamoto does not disclose each and every element of the claims.

With respect to claim 4, the presently claimed printer comprises "a printing cancellation unit which, during printing an image corresponding to received print data, in response to a printing cancellation request operation on an operating panel of the printer, halts said printing, and transmits a data cancellation request to the host to have the host halt a transmission of print data and transmit an initialization request to the printer" and "an initialization unit which initializes an interior of the printer in response to said initialization request so as to scrap all

received print data stored in the printer". See lines 22-25 of page 16, S120 as the supporting disclosure for the amendment.

In contrast, Sakamoto fails to teach this limitation. The presently claimed initialization process that involves operation "so as to scrap all received print data stored in the printer" is different from the step of delete print data S205 of Fig. 2 or S210 of Fig. 13 disclosed in Sakamoto. The deleting steps S205 or S210 delete only the print data up to the job end command rather than "all received print data stored in the printer."

Sakamoto fails to teach each and every step of method claim 15 for the same reasons presented above regarding claim 4. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw this rejection.

Claim 7 includes an analogous requirements: "a printing cancellation unit which, during the printing of an image corresponding to received print data, in response to a printing cancellation request operation on an operating panel of the printer, halts said printing, performs discarding processing of received print data up to a code which indicates a predetermined end-point, and transmits a data cancellation request to the host to have the host halt a transmission of print data" and "an internal reset processing unit which, in response to a reset command transmitted from the host in response to said data cancellation request, performs an internal reset processing to scrap all received print data stored in the printer, and transmits to the host a status response indicating that cancellation is underway." See lines 22-25 of page 16, S120 as the supporting disclosure of the amendment.

For similar reasons as set forth with respect to independent claim 4, this rejection should thus be withdrawn with respect to independent claim 7.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sakamoto in view of Mogi. Applicant traverses and respectfully submits that Sakamoto in view of Mogi does not teach or suggest all the limitations of claim 9. Sakamoto discloses deleting the print data up to the job end command rather than all received print data stored in the printer. Because Mogi does not disclose deleting all the received print data stored in the printer either, Mogi does not compensate for the above-identified deficiencies of Sakamoto. Even taken for what they would have meant as a whole to an artisan of ordinary skill, the combined teachings of these two references would not have (and could not have) led the artisan of ordinary skill to the subject matter of independent claim 9.

Applicant therefore respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

The Examiner rejected claims 11, 13, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sakamoto in view of Mogi in further view of Shima. Applicant traverses and respectfully argues that all three references in combination still fail to teach limitations presently claimed.

With respect to claim 11, the printer comprises "a self-resetting unit which performs self-resetting processing including processing to scrap all received print data inside the printer, when data are not received from the host for a predetermined length of time following the transmission of said data cancellation request to the host by said printing cancellation unit." See lines 2-10 of page 30, S346 as the supporting disclosure of the amendment.

This self-resetting unit is not disclosed in Sakamoto, Mogi, or Shima.

Dependent claim 13 and method claim 17 are patentable for the same reasons presented above regarding claim 11.

Applicant has added the new claim 18. Claim 18 is supported by lines 4-21 of page 26. That is, the printer comprises "a printing cancellation unit which, during printing corresponding to received print job, in response to a printing cancellation request operation on an operating panel of the printer, halts said printing and transmits a data cancellation request with print job ID to said host, so as to cause said host to determine if a current print data corresponds to the print job ID, and to, when the current data corresponds to the job ID, halt transmission of the print data for said print job, attach said job end command to the current print job data, and transmit said job end command to said printer."

Neither Sakamoto nor Shima disclose that the host checks if the print job ID of the data cancellation request corresponds to the current print data which the host generates, and when the print job ID corresponds to the current print data, the host stops transmission of the print data and transmits the job end command to the printer. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that new claim 18 patentably distinguishes over the prior art.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Applicant herewith petitions the Director of the USPTO to extend the time for reply to the above-identified Office Action for an appropriate length of time, if necessary. Unless a check is attached, any fee due under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(a) is being paid via the USPTO Electronic Filing System, or if not paid through EFS, the USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
Application No.: 10/644,095

Attorney Docket No.: Q76922

fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

/Kelly G. Hyndman 39,234/
Kelly G. Hyndman
Registration No. 39,234

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: October 18, 2007